

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1-20 are currently pending in this application, of which claims 1, 6, 7, 11, 16, and 17 are independent. In the Final Office Action dated September 23, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,257,206 ("*Hanson*").

Applicant has amended claims 1, 6-11, 16, and 17 to more particularly define the invention. No new subject matter has been added. Support for the amendments may be found, for example, at page 14, lines 21-23, at page 15, lines 11-15, and at page 26, line 20. Applicant respectfully submit that amended claims 1-20 overcome the Examiner's rejections.

With regard to amended claim 1, Applicant submits that *Hanson* at least fails to show or suggest "generating one or more alarms at one or more apparatuses to be managed" and "transmitting alarm data associated with each alarm from the apparatus to an alarm management apparatus, wherein the alarm data includes a date and time at which the alarm was generated." *Hanson*, in its relevant portions, merely refers to collecting and storing data on a process variable and using an off-line computer to detect special cause variations based on the stored variable data. Col. 2, lines 5-43 and col. 6, lines 42-49. Moreover, *Hanson's* collected variable data is "obtained as data samples at pre-determined sampling intervals." Col. 5, lines 67 and 68. Therefore, *Hanson's* collected variable data is completely unrelated to detection of an alarm situation and fails to contemplate "generating one or more alarms at one or more apparatuses to be managed" and "transmitting alarm data associated with each alarm

from the apparatus to an alarm management apparatus, wherein the alarm data includes a date and time at which the alarm was generated,” as claimed in amended claim 1.

Accordingly, at least because *Hanson* fails to show or suggest each and every feature of amended claim 1, amended claim 1 is patentable over *Hanson* under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Each of amended independent claims 6, 7, 11, 16, and 17 contain novel features that substantially correspond to the novel features discussed above in connection with amended claim 1 and are, therefore, also patentable over *Hanson* under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Dependent claims 2-5, 8-10, 12-15, and 18-20 each depend from one of independent claims 6, 7, 11, 16, and 17 and are, therefore, additionally patentable over *Hanson* under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) at least because of their dependency on a patentable base claim.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. The preceding remarks are based only on some of the relevant arguments in the Final Office Action, and therefore do not address all patentable aspects of the invention. The claims may include other unaddressed elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: December 22, 2005

By: 

Cathy C. Ding
Reg. No. 52,820